UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,047	02/17/2004	Steven P. Gygi	57559 (70207)	8390
21874 FDWARDS A	7590 02/04/2008 NGELL PALMER & D	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 55874			· SHEN, BIN	
BOSTON, MA 02205		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			1657	· · · · ·
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
•		•	02/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/781,047	GYGI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
•	Bin Shen	1657			
The MAILING DATE of this communication					
Period for Reply	···				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNION R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r n. sriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tatute, cause the application to become AE	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		·			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3	0 October 2007.				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ 3	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
,					
closed in accordance with the practice und	ler <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	0. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6-22 and 25</u> is/are pending in the	application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6-22 and 25</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	M. A. R. Carrier				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)					
Applicant may not request that any objection to					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action of form P10-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		•			
 Certified copies of the priority document 					
2. Certified copies of the priority docum					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the		received in this National Stage			
application from the International Bu		raceived			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	inst of the certified copies flot	1000ivou.			
Attachment(s)	سانت المعادل ا	Summany (PTO-413)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of I	nformal Patent Application 			

Art Unit: 1657

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 30 Oct 2007 has been entered.

Status of the Claims

Claims 6-22 and 25 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desiderio (J Chromatography B 1999;731:3-21) in view of Gerber et al. (Anal. Chem. 2001, 73:1651-1657).

Desiderio teaches a method for determining the presence/quantity of a target polypeptide in a mixture of different polypeptides by providing a mixture of human tissue extracts (from human with metabolic defects and normal control-page 5, 2.1 and 2.2), adding two known quantity of labeled (labeled differently with stable isotopes) peptide internal standard (page 5, 2.4), treating the mixture with a protease (trypsin-page 7, 2.6), fragmenting the peptides in the mixture by multistage mass spectrometry (tandem mass spectrometer-page 7, 2.8), determining the ratio of labeled fragments to unlabeled fragments and calculating the quantity of the target

Art Unit: 1657

polypeptide in the mixture (page 7, 2.10.1 and page 8, 2.10.2). Peptides are separated by HPLC chromatograph (page 6, under Chromatograph, 2.5.1-2.5.4) and the fractions (elutent and coelutent) are shown in Fig. 5-7. The presence/quantity of target polypeptide is diagnostic of a cell state where the cell state is representative of an abnormal physiological response (human pituitary macroadenomas-page 9, 3.1), and the target polypeptide is determined in at least two mixtures (abstract and for details see pages 9-14, pages 14-17).

Desiderio does not teach a single peptide internal standard in the method.

Gerber teaches a chromatography/mass spectrometry method for determining multiple enzyme activities in human cell lysates using a single internal standard (page 1652, right column, 2nd full paragraph). Gerber also teaches that the internal standard is chemically identical to the enzyme product and contain isotope (page 1652, right column, 2nd full paragraph, lines 4-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Desiderio by using a single peptide internal standard in the method because protease activity is used and Gerber teaches the use of a single internal standard which is identical to the enzyme product (peptide as the product of protease) in the same chromatography/mass spectrometry method. One would have been motivated to make the modification because Desiderio et al. specifically described a method for determining the presence/quantity of a target polypeptide in a mixture of different polypeptides with two peptide internal standard, and would reasonably have expected success because Gerber teach the use of an internal standard that is chemically identical to the enzyme product in the same method (page 1652, right column, 2nd full paragraph). One internal standard is recognized as equivalent of two internal standard for the same purpose (see MPEP §2144.06), thus using one internal standard that is chemically identical to the enzyme product as taught by Gerber for the predictable result of determining the presence/quantity of a target peptide is obvious.

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention.

Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Art Unit: 1657

Applicant's arguments file 10/30/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the cited reference discloses the use of two, differently labeled peptide internal standards, and the pending claims require only one labeled peptide internal standard.

It is the examiner's position that the newly cited reference of Gerber teaches the use of a single internal standard that is chemically identical to the enzyme product, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art of mass spectrometry at the time the invention was made to replace two peptide internal standard taught by Desiderio with one peptide internal standard which is the product of the protease activity as suggested by Gerber to yield predictable results.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Art Unit 1657 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). The official fax telephone number for the Group is 571-273-8300. NOTE: If Applicant *does* submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of

Art Unit: 1657

document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

Any inquiry concerning rejections or objections in this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bin Shen, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-9040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from about 9:00 AM to about 5:30 PM. A phone message left at this number will be responded to as soon as possible (i.e., shortly after the examiner returns to her office).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Jon Weber can be reached at (571) 272-0925.

B Shen

Art Unit 1657

JONWEBER

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINED